

## Appendix B CEQA Environmental Checklist

The following CEQA Environmental Checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. The CEQA impact levels include potentially significant impact, less than significant impact with mitigation, less than significant impact, and no impact. Please refer to the following for detailed discussions regarding impacts under CEQA:

- Guidance: Title 14, Chapter 3, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.
- Statutes: Division 13, California Public Resource Code, Sections 21000-21178.1

In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the project indicate no impacts. A "no impact" reflects this determination. Any needed discussion is included in the section following the checklist.

The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts (unless otherwise noted). CEQA requires that environmental documents determine significant or potentially significant impacts, NEPA does not. Addressing significant or potentially significant impacts in joint CEQA and NEPA environmental documents can be confusing, especially in those instances where the two laws and implementing regulations have different thresholds of significance. Under NEPA, the degree of impact to a resource is used only to determine which NEPA document is necessary. Once the federal agency has determined the magnitude of a project's impacts and the level of documentation required, it is the magnitude of the impact that is evaluated in the environmental document, not the degree of significance. For the purpose of the impact discussion in this document, determination of significant or potentially significant impacts is made only in the context of CEQA.

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation **AESTHETICS -** Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway? Visual changes due to removal of lacksquaremedian and shoulder plantings, including oleander; replacement planting is proposed in suitable and feasible roadside locations (See Section 2.1.7) c) Substantially degrade the existing  $\overline{\mathsf{V}}$ visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? Removal of vegetation and  $\sqrt{}$ construction of a median barrier and soundwalls would introduce new sources of glare. Where feasible, vines would be planted on the walls to reduce glare. (See Section 2.1.7) **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In** determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project: a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?

**CEQA** Less than Less than Potentially significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? **AIR QUALITY - Where available, the** significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or  $ldsymbol{
ellipsi}$ state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration? e) Create objectionable odors affecting a

substantial number of people?

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would** the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Bridges over creeks will not be widened; this will avoid impacts to potential habitat areas; see Section 2.3.1. b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or  $oldsymbol{
olimits}$ regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? Bridges over creeks will not be widened; this will avoid impacts to wetland areas; see Section 2.3.2. d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological  $ldsymbol{
ellipsi}$ resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

 $ldsymbol{
ellipsi}$ 

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,

habitat conservation plan?

Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state

**CEQA** 

	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
<b>COMMUNITY RESOURCES -</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause disruption of orderly planned development?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
b) Be inconsistent with a Coastal Zone Management Plan?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
c) Affect life-styles, or neighborhood character or stability?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
d) Physically divide an established community?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
e) Affect minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
f) Affect employment, industry, or commerce, or require the displacement of businesses or farms?				
g) Affect property values or the local tax base?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
h) Affect any community facilities (including medical, educational, scientific, or religious institutions, ceremonial sites or sacred shrines?				
i) Result in alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
j) Support large commercial or residential development?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
k) Affect wild or scenic rivers or natural landmarks?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
l) Result in substantial impacts associated with construction activities (e.g., noise, dust, temporary drainage, traffic detours, and temporary access, etc.)? Best Management Practices would minimize construction phase impacts. (See Section 2.4)				

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation **CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would** the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in lacksquarethe significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? **GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the** project: a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of  $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. The project will conform to current seismic design standards. (See **Section 2.2.3**) ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? The project will conform to current  $\square$ seismic design standards (See Section 2.2.3) iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? The project will conform to current seismic design standards (See Section 2.2.3) iv) Landslides?

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform  $oldsymbol{
olimits}$ Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -** Would the project: a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release  $oldsymbol{
olimits}$ of hazardous materials into the environment? Pre-existing aerially deposited lead would be removed or re-used in accordance with DTSC ADL variance. See Section 2.2.5. c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Pre-existing aerially deposited lead would be removed or re-used in accordance with DTSC ADL variance. See Section 2.2.5.

**CEQA** Less than significant impact with mitigation Potentially significant impact Less than significant impact No impact

	magaaon	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		V
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		$\overline{\checkmark}$
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:		
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		V
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		

**CEQA** 

	CEQA			
	Potentially significant impact	Less than significant impact with mitigation	Less than significant impact	No impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				V
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				V
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				$\checkmark$
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				V

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation **LAND USE AND PLANNING -**Would the project: a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general M plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? b) Conflict with any applicable habitat lacksquareconservation plan or natural community conservation plan? MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project: a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource  $| \checkmark |$ recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? **NOISE -** Would the project: a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards M of other agencies? There will be impacts requiring consideration of abatement measures (soundwalls). See Section 2.2.7. b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing lacksquarewithout the project? Construction noise will be minimized by equipment noise control and administrative measures. (See Section 2.4.10.) e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose  $ldsymbol{
ellipsi}$ people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? **POPULATION AND HOUSING -**Would the project: a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation **PUBLIC SERVICES** a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities? **RECREATION** a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or  $\square$ expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -Would the project: a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial lacksquareincrease in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard  $ldsymbol{
ellipsi}$ established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in  $oldsymbol{
olimits}$ traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incomplete uses (e.g., farm equipment)? e) Result in inadequate emergency access? f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? Project encourages carpooling and transit use. **UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -**Would the project: a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional

Water Quality Control Board?

**CEQA** Less than Potentially Less than significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from lacksquareexisting entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? e) Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has  $oldsymbol{
olimits}$ inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? f) Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? MANDATORY FINDINGS OF **SIGNIFICANCE** a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below selfsustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods

of California history or prehistory?

**CEQA** Less than Less than Potentially significant significant significant No impact impact with impact impact mitigation b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental lacksquareeffects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial lacksquareadverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? **SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES - Does** the project: a) Result in the use of any publicly owned land from a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, as defined by section 4(f) (23 CFR 771.135)? b) Affect a significant archaeological or historic site, structure, object, or building, as defined by section 4(f) (23 CFR 771.135)? c) Involve "constructive use," as defined by section 4(f) (23 CFR 771.135)?